



AF

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

	Application Number	09/961,234	
	Filing Date	SEPTEMBER 24, 2001	
	First Named Inventor	ROYALL, WILLIAM A., JR.	
	Art Unit	2162	
	Examiner Name	CORRIELUS, JEAN M.	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	7	Attorney Docket Number	ROY03 001

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)			
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC	
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached	<input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition	<input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> After Final	<input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information	
<input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation	<input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter	
<input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address	<input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request	<input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer	DUPLICATE OF THIS TRANSMITTAL.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement	<input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund		
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____		
<input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD		
<input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Remarks		
PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW.			

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm Name	DUANE MORRIS LLP		
Signature			
Printed name	MARK C. COMTOIS	DOC# DM2\1306316.1	
Date	NOVEMBER 15, 2007	Reg. No.	46,285

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature			
Typed or printed name		Date	

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. ROY03 001

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Patent Application of: William A. ROYALL, Jr., et al.

Confirmation No.: 6263

Serial No.: 09/961,234

Art Unit: 2162

Filed: September 24, 2001

Examiner: Jean M. Corrielus

**Title: METHOD OF GENERATING INCREASED APPLICATIONS FOR
ENROLLMENT AT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS**

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicant respectfully requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application in view of the following remarks.

REMARKS

I. **The rejection of Claims 6 and 12-14 under §102(b) is improper as Noël-Levitz does not disclose each and every limitation in the claims.**

1. The Office acknowledges that Noël-Levitz does not disclose each and every limitation. The Office states that “**Noël-Levitz does not explicitly provide a web site containing links to a survey and to a partial application; assigning a unique access number (“PIN”) to each candidate in the target group; electronically mailing each candidate in the target group the assigned PIN and an invitation to use the PIN to access the website; providing each candidate accessing the web site and indicating a continuing interest in the education institution with electronic access to the partial application; for each candidate who electronically accesses the partial application**” as required in Claim 12 and similarly Claim 13. See Office Action, May 18, 2007, pages 3 and 4.
2. The Office does not attempt to rely on inherency but rather hints at obviousness and brings in additional references in an attempt to correct the deficiencies as discussed in the Applicants’ Response of August 17, 2007, page 6.
3. Noël-Levitz does not disclose a partial application or the steps involving a partial application as recited in the claims. See Applicant’s response of August 17, 2006, pages 6 and 7.
4. Noël-Levitz does not disclose customizing the partial application or any type of application with personal information from the database.

The Office cites pages 18 and 19 “making [it] all work together” of Noël-Levitz as the basis of disclosure for this limitation. However, even the most imaginative reading of pages 18 and 19, would fail to provide such a teaching. The mere fact of data being recorded throughout the processes is not a teaching of using that data to customize a partial application, as required in Claims 12 and 13. In fact Noël-Levitz teaches what to do with the data, “Information mined from the data being gathered should be used to target admissions travel, select tele-counseling prospects, segment direct mail programs, build interest in special events, and predict enrollment trends while there is still time to intervene.” Noël-Levitz, page 19. This data is not nor could it be used to customize partial applications.

5. Noël-Levitz does not disclose all of the limitations in the claim and fails to provide a disclosure of a partial application and associated operations, thus the anticipated rejection by the Office is improper.

II. The § 103 rejection of Claims 6 and 12-14 is improper because the Office’s relies on the disclosure of Noël-Levitz for limitations that are simply not disclosed in Noël-Levitz.

1. Noël-Levitz does not disclose a partial application or the steps involving a partial application as recited in the claims. See Applicant’s response of August 17, 2007, pages 6 and 7.

2. Noël-Levitz does not disclose customizing the partial application or any type of application with personal information from the database. See I.(4) above

3. Noël Levitz does not disclose a “partial application” separate and apart from “a full application” as recited in Claim 12 and therefore cannot meet all the relied upon claim

limitations relied upon by the Office. *See* Applicants' response of August 17, 2007, page 7, last paragraph; *See also* Applicants' response of March 1, 2007, page 6, last paragraph.

4. The Office's reliance on the statement "Noël-Levitz continually update the prospective interest profile with each contact (pages 4 and 5), wherein the qualifying codes help rate and track the prospects interest in the institution at various stages of the recruiting process (pages 18 and 19)" Office Action of May 18, 2007, pages 4 and 6 to both meet and then render obvious the limitations of "provide a web site containing links to a survey and to a partial application; assigning a unique access number ("PIN") to each candidate in the target group; electronically mailing each candidate in the target group the assigned PIN and an invitation to use the PIN to access the website; providing each candidate accessing the web site and indicating a continuing interest in the education institution with electronic access to the partial application; for each candidate who electronically accesses the partial application", Office Action of May 17, 2007, page 4, as required in Claim 12 and similarly Claim 13 is so completely without merit the Applicant is at a loss for words. *See* Applicant's response of March 1, 2007, pages 3 and 4.

III. The § 103 rejection of Claims 6 and 12-14 is improper because the Office relies on teaching in the prior art that are not present or do not obviate the deficiencies of Noël-Levitz.

1. Schillewaert does not disclose what the Office purports. The Office reliance on Schillewaert to provide the limitations that "Noël-Levitz does not explicitly provide" is without any merit. *See* Applicant's response of March 1, 2007, page 5.

2. The addition of Thomas does not obviate the deficiencies of what ““Noël-Levitz does not explicitly provide”. See Applicant’s response of March 1, 2007, page 6.

IV. Conclusion

The Applicant requests review of the Final Rejection and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the above comments and the Applicant’s previous responses. The Applicant also request allowance of the Application including claims.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark C. Comtois

Reg. No. 46,285

DUANE MORRIS LLP
1667 K Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 776-7800
Telecopier: (202) 776-7801
Date: November 15, 2007